

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

KIRSHA BROWN-YOUNGER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SALVATION ARMY,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:11-cv-01036-GMN-GWF

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Deposition (#39), filed on March 27, 2013. Plaintiff filed a Motion (#43) to strike Defendant's Motion to Compel (#39), which the Court denied on April 11, 2013. *See Order, Doc. #46*. Plaintiff also filed a Motion (#53) for a protective order against being deposed by Defendant in Las Vegas. Plaintiff did not file any response to the Motion to Compel (#39). The Court conducted a hearing on the Motion (#39) on May 10, 2013. *See Minutes of Proceedings, Doc. #56*. Plaintiff did not appear telephonically or in person at the hearing.

As stated on the record at the May 10 hearing, Plaintiff has not demonstrated adequate reason why her deposition cannot occur in Las Vegas, Nevada, where Plaintiff filed this action. Defendant represented at the hearing that Plaintiff has numerous other suits pending in this District, and the Court finds Plaintiff has not made a sufficient financial showing to justify a protective order against her being deposed in Las Vegas. Therefore, the Court will grant Defendant's Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Deposition (#39) and deny Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order (#53). Plaintiff's failure to attend her deposition may result in the imposition of sanctions. Furthermore, the Court will extend the discovery in this matter until June 14, 2013 to permit Defendant to re-notice Plaintiff's deposition.

1 Defendant is instructed to schedule the deposition near the end of this extended discovery period to  
2 allow Plaintiff to make arrangements.

3 Plaintiff also filed a Motion to Compel (#48) Defendant to answer Plaintiff's Interrogatories on  
4 April 25, 2013. Defendant represented at the hearing that it has responded to Plaintiff's Interrogatories.  
5 On May 6, 2013, Plaintiff filed an "Opposition Response to Defendant's Interrogatories" (#54), which  
6 the Court construes as an additional Motion to Compel responses to her Interrogatories. Therein,  
7 Plaintiff asserts general objections to Defendant's responses. As stated on the record, the Court will  
8 deny the Motions (#48, #54) because Plaintiff has not lodged specific objections to Defendant's  
9 responses. If Plaintiff wishes to compel further responses to her interrogatories, the Court instructs her  
10 first to meet and confer with Defendant. In the event such efforts are unsuccessful and Plaintiff files  
11 another motion to compel, she is instructed to include specific, reasonable, and adequate bases to  
12 compel further responses.

13 Defendant also represented at the hearing that Plaintiff did not respond to its Second Set of  
14 Interrogatories. In her Motion (#48), Plaintiff included what the Court construes as objections to the  
15 Interrogatories. Defendant is instructed, to the extent that it wishes to obtain further responses, to file  
16 an appropriate motion. Accordingly,

17 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Compel (#39) is **granted**.

18 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the discovery deadline in this case is extended to **June 14,**  
19 **2013** for the limited purpose of completing the discovery addressed in this Order.

20 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order (#53) is **denied**.


21 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (#48) is **denied** without  
22 prejudice.

23 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's "Opposition Response" (#54), which the Court  
24 construes as a Motion to Compel, is **denied** without prejudice.

25 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Extend Time (#44) is  
26 **denied** as moot.

27 ...

28 ...

  
GEORGE FOLEY, JR.  
United States Magistrate Judge